

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.




UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,472	11/02/2001	Srinivas Gutta	US010529	7064
24737	7590	09/08/2004	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			SAIN, GAUTAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/004,472	GUTTA, SRINIVAS 	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gautam Sain	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/04, 11/01</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1) The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1-1) Claims 1, 4-9, 11-15, 17, 19-22, 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 102(e) as being anticipated by Leak et al (US 6182072, issued Jan 30, 2001).

Regarding claims 1, 17, Leak teaches generating ... by a user (ie., hit list of web search engine)(col 6, lines 25-36; fig 7, item 100).

Leak teaches allowing ... links (ie., web site with links)(col 6, lines 25-50).

Leak teaches identifying ... accessed by said user, and updating ... hit list (ie., URI are marked as visited and/or deleted from the list)(col 8, lines 24-26; col 8, lines 50-54; col 7, lines 30-40).

Regarding claim 4, Leak teaches repeating steps (b) through (d) of claim 1 (ie., routine repeats for successive generations in hierarchy)(col 8, line 55- col 9, line 12).

Regarding claims 5, 12, 19, 26, Leak teaches ... accessing ... web site (ie., number of links to other web pages on the level 1 web site to level 2 web pages)(col 7, lines 15-50; fig 9, item 903).

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding claims 6, 15, 22, 29, Leak teaches rearranging ... criteria (ie., web page displayed in a sequence for a defined time ... varied to accommodate the client system)(col 7, lines 44-55).

Regarding claims 7, 13, 20, 27, Leak teaches hypertext ... links (ie., image maps)(fig 1, items 109-111).

Regarding claim 8, 14, 21, 28, Leak teaches hypertext ... (URL) address (ie., html page with associated URI)(col 6, lines 58-60).

Regarding claims 9, 11, 25, leak teaches displaying ... said user (ie., displaying web pages)(col 7, lines 40-50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2-1) Claims 2, 3, 10, 16, 18, 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leak (as cited above).

Regarding claims 2, 16, 23, Leak does not expressly teach, but it would have been commonly known to one of ordinary skill in the art that *displaying ... search* (ie., obvious that the remaining list is the update list of pages not visited by the user)(col 8, lines 51-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Leak to include updating the remaining list of pages not yet visited

by the user since only the visited ones are deleted as taught by Leak, providing the benefit of displaying hypertext links for locating one of a plurality of web pages as a result of a Web search (Abstract section) so that less effort is required by the person to view pages (col 1, lines 65-67).

Regarding claims 3, 18, Leak does not expressly teach, but it would have been commonly known to one of ordinary skill in the art that returning said hit list ... website (ie., a pop-up window pops up for selecting more items; the original menu still remains in the original/modified in the original window that user can go back to)(col 8, lines 34-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Leak to include a original menu list with the remaining hit list for the user to select hit options as taught by Leak, providing the benefit of displaying hypertext links for locating one of a plurality of web pages as a result of a Web search (Abstract section) so that less effort is required by the person to view pages (col 1, lines 65-67).

Regarding claims 10, Leak does not expressly teach, but it would have been commonly known to one of ordinary skill in the art that receiving a search request from a user (ie., conventional search engines *receive search request from users*, in this case from a remote control for television shows, media, ...)(col 3, lines 1-5; col 2, lines 67 teaches that users can request pages).

Leak teaches generating ... by a user (ie., hit list of web search engine)(col 6, lines 25-36; fig 7, item 100).

Leak teaches monitoring ... search mode and removing ... hit list (ie., URI are marked as visited and/or deleted from the list)(col 8, lines 24-26; col 8, lines 50-54; col 7, lines 30-40).

Leak does not expressly teach, but it would have been commonly known to one of ordinary skill in the art that reproducing ... hit list based on the outcome (ie., obvious that the remaining list is the update list of pages not visited by the user)(col 8, lines 51-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Leak to include a search engine that receives search request from users and updating the remaining list of pages not yet visited by the user since only the visited ones are deleted as taught by Leak, providing the benefit of displaying hypertext links for locating one of a plurality of web pages as a result of a Web search (Abstract section) so that less effort is required by the person to view pages (col 1, lines 65-67).

Regarding claims 24, Leak teaches memory ... code (ie., mass storage device)(col 5, line 55; fig 5, item 5).

Leak teaches processor ... memory (ie., CPU)(fig 5, item 50).

Leak does not expressly teach, but it would have been commonly known to one of ordinary skill in the art that *receiving a search request from a user* (ie., conventional search engines receive search request from users, in this case from a remote control for television shows, media, ...)(col 3, lines 1-5; col 2, lines 67 teaches that users can request pages).

Leak teaches generating ... request (ie., hit list of web search engine)(col 6, lines 25-36; fig 7, item 100).

Leak teaches monitoring ... search mode (ie., URI are marked as visited and/or deleted from the list)(col 8, lines 24-26; col 8, lines 50-54; col 7, lines 30-40).

Leak does not expressly teach, but it would have been commonly known to one of ordinary skill in the art that updating ... hit list (ie., obvious that the remaining list is the update list of pages not visited by the user)(col 8, lines 51-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Leak to include a search engine that receives search request from users and updating the remaining list of pages not yet visited by the user since only the visited ones are deleted as taught by Leak, providing the benefit of displaying hypertext links for locating one of a plurality of web pages as a result of a Web search (Abstract section) so that less effort is required by the person to view pages (col 1, lines 65-67).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 703-305-8777. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703)305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

6.5 -

GS


SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER